



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.              | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/080,815   | 02/22/2002  | Marie Mung Wah Low   | 16356.608 (DC-02942)             | 9882             |
| 27683  | 7590        | 07/19/2005           |                                  |                  |
| HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP<br>901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100<br>DALLAS, TX 75202 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>MCFADDEN, SUSAN IRIS |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2655                 | PAPER NUMBER     |
| DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005  |             |                      |                                  |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/080,815

Applicant(s)

WAH LOW ET AL.

Examiner

Susan McFadden

Art Unit

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-22-02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2,4,7-9,11, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (6,848,080).

In regard to claims 1 and 2, Lee et al. show a computer-implemented method for comparing multiple databases which each comprise Chinese text data items, the method comprising: for each of the databases, converting any of the Chinese text data items which are not in a predefined common Chinese language (such as Pin Yin) format into that common format, any items in at least a first of the databases which are convertible into the common format in multiple ways being converted in all those ways; and comparing the data items in the common format, to identify Chinese text data items in the first database corresponding to Chinese text data items in the second database (Fig. 4, col. 6-7).

In regard to claims 8,9, and 16, Lee et al. show a computer system for comparing multiple databases which each comprise Chinese text data items, the system comprising: a first conversion unit for converting Chinese text data items of a first

Art Unit: 2655

database into a predefined common Chinese language (such as Pin Yin) format, any items in at least a first of the databases which are convertible into the common format in multiple ways being converted in all those ways; a second conversion unit of converting items in a second database, and a comparison unit for comparing the converted data items to identify Chinese text data items in the first database which correspond to Chinese text data items in the second database (Fig. 4, col. 6-7).

In regard to claims 4 and 11, Lee et al. show that the Chinese text data items of the first database are in Simplified Mandarin characters (col. 2, ln 45-47).

In regard to claims 7, 14, and 15, Lee et al. show that upon comparison of the Chinese text data items, when a match is found, the corresponding item of the first database is removed (Fig. 8, item 814).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (cited above).

In regard to claim 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, and 13, Lee et al. show the system and method discussed above. They do not specifically show that the first database is a database of an order management system and includes data items including a corresponding shipping and/or billing addresses or that the second database is a list of proscribed


Art Unit: 2655

parties issued by a governmental organization. The Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that various databases can store the user-defined information and could include billing addresses and proscribed parties.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan McFadden whose telephone number is 571-272-7621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Susan McFadden  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2655

July 15, 2005